

ENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMER.
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,713	12/16/2003	Thomas Brandenborg	45900-000449/US/DVA	3442
30593 7590 05/12/2008 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. BOX 8910			EXAMINER	
			DWIVEDI, MA	MAHESH H
RESTON, VA 20195			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2168	
,			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		REVIEWED BY DOCKET
RECEIVEN	Matter no to 1.2 U.S	Atty
MAY 1 3 2008	Action Rue Date 1 6 08 Final Date 2020	DKT Verify
20 2000	Action of A READ DKT/Verify C MM	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE	Ma	nter No.



Notice of Abandonment

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/735,713	BRANDENBORG, THOMAS	
Examiner	Art Unit	
MAHESH H DWIVEDI	2168	

- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover shee	t with the correspondence address
This application is abandoned in view of:	
 Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on <u>17 Octors</u> (a) A reply was received on (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission d period for reply (including a total extension of time of month(s)) which extension of time of month(s) 	ated), which is after the expiration of the
(b) A proposed reply was received on, but it does not constitute a proper re	eply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a ti application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with a Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).	mely filed amendment which places the appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for
(c) ☐ A reply was received on but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a befinal rejection See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 belo	
(d) 🖾 No reply has been received.	
 Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applic from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85). 	
(a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on (wit), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the i Allowance (PTOL-85).	
(b) The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A balance of \$ is due.	
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ The publication fee, if req	uired by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$
(c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.	
 Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the th Allowability (PTO-37). 	ree-month period set in, the Notice of
(a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on (with a Certificate of Ma after the expiration of the period for reply.	illing or Transmission dated), which is
(b) No corrected drawings have been received.	
 The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of rec the applicants. 	ord, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of
 The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application. 	g in a representative capacity under 37 CFR
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.	and because the period for seeking court review
7. 🔀 The reason(s) below:	
See Continuation Sheet	
/Tim T. Vo/ /Mahesh H Dwi	ivedi/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2168 Examiner, Art U	
Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonmental and negative effects on patent term.	ent under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to

Item 7 - Other reasons for holding abandonment: On 05/07/2008, the examiner contacted Mr. John Castellano (Reg # 35,094) to inquire about the status of the instant case. The examiner stated that because a notice of an improper request for an RCE was sent from the Office in response to the RCE filed by the applicant, then as a result, the mailing date of the last office action is in effect. Therefore, the examiner stated that the instant case was abandoned. Mr. Castellano stated that because an IDS was submitted along with the RCE, then the RCE was proper. Moreover, Mr. Castellano intends to submit a petition to revive the instant case.